

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS**

TYLER DIVISION

DATE: March 24, 2011

JUDGE
LEONARD DAVIS

COURT REPORTER
Shea Sloan

Law Clerks: Kori Anne Bagrowski

ADJUSTACAM V AMAZON.COM, ET AL	CIVIL ACTION NO: 6:10-CV-329 STATUS CONFERENCE
ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF	ATTORNEYs FOR DEFENDANTS
SEE SIGN-IN SHEETS	

On this day, came the parties by their attorneys and the following proceedings were had:

OPEN: 9:00 am

ADJOURN: 9:35 am

TIME:	MINUTES:
9:00 am	Case called. Parties announced ready. See Sign-In Sheets. Mr. Daniels addressed Court and they have 8 defendant.
	Court addressed the parties and asked plaintiff to go first with suggestions on case management.
	Mr. Edmonds gave the Court a brief overview of the devices and brought the Court some sample webcams. Court and Mr. Edmonds discussed foreign defendants and service on the other case. Mr. Edmonds continued to address the Court on the similarity of the Defendants.
	Mr. Daniels addressed the Court on the Motion to Stay from the resellers/manufacturers. Mr. Edmonds responded and addressed the Court on discovery. Mr. Daniels replied as to the stay on resellers. Mr. Daniels proposed an early claim construction and Court to entertain an early MSJ. Mr. Edmonds responded and in term of pre-suit damages, MSJ and laches. Mr. Daniels replied on marking and laches issues. Court encouraged the parties to communicate with each other.
	Mr. Daniels addressed the Court proposed a mandatory mediation. Mr. Daniels addressed Court on the 2 petitions for re-examination of the patents and proposed a stay pending re-exams.

DAVID J. MALAND, CLERK

FILED: 3.24.2011

BY: *Rosa L. Ferguson* , Courtroom Deputy

PAGE 2 - Proceedings Continued

TIME:	MINUTES:
	Mr. Partridge addressed the Court on behalf of Dell and post-suit sale units and going through damages discovery and suggests that instead of being subject to damages discovery, have an agreed upon scope of damage discovery. Mr. Edmonds responded on the reasonable terms tied to sales. Mr. Partridge replied. In order to have a structured resolution, that there should be a limited disclosure on damages.
	Court inquired of plaintiff on initial round of disclosures. Mr. Edmonds does not have a problem with it. Mr. Partridge indicated they could do it within 2 weeks. Mr. Daniels responded. Court denied Motion to Stay. Court inquired if they could provide disclosure within 2 weeks. Mr. Daniels responded.
	Mr. Philben addressed the Court and will have to check with his . Mr. Donahue asked for 3 or 4 weeks.
	<p>Court addressed the parties and will grant leave to file marking MSJ immediately and encourage to communicate with plaintiff; not going to look at laches at this point. Court inquired as to mediator. Court would like mediation after disclosures. Court denies motion in regard to re-exam. After this request is done Court ordered parties to meet and confer and modify DCO & Discovery Order consistent with these rulings and get it down at what's at issue. If not, Court will move on regular discovery order and DCO. Mr. Craft addressed the Court regarding dates. Court gave the parties the following dates:</p> <p>Markman Hearing: February 9, 2012 at 9:00 a.m. Pretrial Conference: December 18, 2012 at 9:00 am Jury Selection: January 7, 2013 at 9:00 a.m. Jury Trial: January 14, 2013 at 9:00 a.m.</p>
9:35 am	There being nothing further, Court adjourned.